

REMARKS

With this amendment, claims 22-69 are pending. Claims 22, 37, 41, 53, 65, 67, and 68 have been rewritten. Claim 23 has been cancelled. It is believed that no new matter is added by this amendment.

5 It is respectfully submitted that the above revisions are made solely for the purposes of expediting the patent application process. Moreover, Applicants further submit that no claims have been narrowed for reasons relating to the statutory requirements for patentability.

Applicants have included a credit card payment form for the small entity fee for a one-month extension of time (\$55.00). It is not believed that any other fees are necessary at this 10 time. However, in the event other fees are required, Applicants authorize the Commissioner to take any necessary fees, including those under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17, from deposit account 50-0913.

**I. Examiner Interview Summary**

15 The Applicants sincerely thank Examiner Williams for the interview held on April 23, 2003. Applicants are very grateful for the opportunity to discuss their invention with the Examiner and for the Examiner's helpful discussion of the outstanding objections and rejections.

During the interview, Applicants presented their arguments for patentability over Ramachandran. Agreement was reached that inclusion of language in Applicants' claims that the 20 second compartment was outside of the first compartment would overcome the rejection over Ramachandran. Applicants also discussed the Office's objection to the drawings.

## II. Objection to the drawings

The Office objected to the drawings as allegedly failing to illustrate all elements of the claims. The Office alleged that the drawings failed to show the secure second compartment. Applicants have cancelled claim 23, believed to be the only claim directed to a  
5 secure second compartment. Applicants respectfully request that the objection of the drawings be withdrawn.

## III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 22-26, 36-38, 41-35, 47, 48, 53-57, 59, 60, and 65-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,788,348 to Ramachandran et al.  
10 (hereinafter, Ramachandran). Applicants disclose a printer system, one of the advantages of which is improved serviceability, including ease of access. *See* page 12, lines 11-16. In one embodiment, Applicants disclose that the printer system may be mounted in a compartment that is adjacent to secure second compartment. *See id.* and Figure 12. The printer compartment and second compartment may be separated by a wall; the wall preferably has a hole, which allows a  
15 printer lock to extend from the printer compartment into the secure second compartment. In this way, the secure compartment must be opened before the printer lock can be actuated.

By contrast, Ramachandran purports to suggest an automated teller machine (ATM) having an enclosure that appears to contain various serviceable components. *See* abstract. The Office relied, in part, on Figure 3 of Ramachandran for the present rejections.

20 The Office alleged that Figure 3 of Ramachandran shows a first compartment 26, within which is a second compartment 14, within which a printer can be located. The Office alleged

that Figure 3 of Ramachandran disclosed, as claimed by Applicants (for example in claim 41): “a second compartment in close relative proximity to the first compartment....”

Applicants believe the claims as originally filed sufficiently distinguish Applicants’ invention from Ramachandran. It appears that the second compartment lies within a first compartment in Ramachandran. In the interest of advancing this case towards allowance, 5 Applicants have rewritten the pending independent claims to make it more clear that the first compartment is not within the second compartment (or vice versa).

Because this feature of Applicants’ invention has not been shown in Ramachandran, Applicants assert that Ramachandran fails to teach all of the claimed elements of Applicants’ 10 invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 22, 24-26, 36-38, 41-35, 47, 48, 53-57, 59, 60, and 65-69. Claim 23 has been cancelled. Applicants believe that these claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request such.

#### **IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

15 The Office rejected claims 27-35, 39, 40, 46, 49-52, 58, and 61-64 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ramachandran in view of U.S. Patent 5,180,232 to Chadima (hereinafter, Chadima), U.S. Patent 4,265,552 to Bemis (hereinafter, Bemis), or U.S. Patent 5,442,567 to Small (hereinafter, Small). The rejected claims depend from independent claim 22, 37, 41, or 53, which have been rejected under §102(b) over Ramachandran. However, as discussed above, 20 Ramachandran does not appear to teach a device, as taught by Applicants, having a printer assembly in a compartment (which may or may not be secure) next to, but not within, an additional, secure, compartment. The cited references do not disclose all of the claimed elements of Applicants’ invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office has not

established a prima facie case of obviousness and request the §103(a) rejection of claims 27-35, 39, 40, 46, 49-52, 58, and 61-64 be withdrawn.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. If the

- 5 Examiner has any questions regarding the application or this response, the Examiner is encouraged to call the Applicants' attorney, Ryan A. Heck, at (775) 826-6160.

10 Respectfully Submitted,

15 Ryan A. Heck, Ph.D.

Reg. No. 51,795

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

15 Ian F. Burns & Associates, P.C.  
1575 Delucchi Lane, Suite 222  
Reno, NV 89502  
(775) 826-6160

20 May 2, 2003